

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of oath of office

Raymond Fagan William J. Bowen
George A. Hottle Falconer Smith
Samuel B. Salvin

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date indicated

Edwin D. Merrill, March 25, 1946.
Vernon G. Guenther, October 8, 1945.
Manrico A. Troncelliti, February 8, 1946.
Herbert Tabor, January 1, 1946.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer, effective January 30, 1946

Donald L. Snow

To be temporary medical director

Franklin J. Halpin

To be temporary surgeons

Eugene J. Gillespie Robert W. Blach
Charles W. Parker Frederick K. Albrecht
Carlton H. Waters Alfred H. Lawton
John L. Lincoln Marion B. Richmond
Clarence B. Mayes Glen E. Ogden
Donald W. McNaughton

To be temporary senior assistant surgeon
Robert E. Staff

To be temporary senior dental surgeon
George A. Nevitt

To be temporary dental surgeons

John C. Heckel
Joseph E. Unsworth

To be temporary senior assistant dental surgeon

Stanley J. Ruzicka

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Adjutant General's Department

Maj. Clifton Coleman Carter
Maj. Luther Gordon Causey

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Marion Hopkins May
First Lt. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. William Aldrich Davis
First Lt. John Breed Deane
First Lt. Orville Kenneth Knight
First Lt. George Franklin Leist
First Lt. Warren Newcomb Wildrick

To Cavalry

Second Lt. Gerald Dean Hall.
Second Lt. Chester Craig Sargent

To Field Artillery

Lt. Col. Charles Royal Lehner
First Lt. Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr.
First Lt. Cecil Wray Page, Jr.
First Lt. Robert James Welsh

To Infantry

Second Lt. William Patrick Hunt, Jr.

To Air Corps

First Lt. Nathan Louis Krisberg

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be majors, Air Corps

Robert Edward Lee Choate, subject to examination required by law.
Edwin Roland French
John Williams Persons
William Chamberlayne Bentley, Jr., subject to examination required by law.
Sam Williamson Cheyney, subject to examination required by law.
Max Harrelson Warren, subject to examination required by law.
Edwin Lee Tucker, subject to examination required by law.
Ralph Rhudy

Isaac William Ott, subject to examination required by law.

Edward Holmes Underhill
Trenholm Jones Meyer, subject to examination required by law.

William Pryor Sloan, subject to examination required by law.

George Frost Kinzie
Albert Boyd
James Wayne McCauley
Edward Harrison Alexander
Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr.
William Albert Matheny
John Patrick Kenny
Reginald Franklin Conroy Vance, subject to examination required by law.

William Lecel Lee
Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr.
Paul Mueller Jacobs
Dudley Durward Hale
Herbert Leonard Grills
Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, subject to examination required by law.

Thomas Lee Mosley
Raymond Lloyd Winn
Leonard Franklin Harman, subject to examination required by law.

Kingston Eric Tibbetts
Richard Henry Lee
Robert Wilson Stewart
Lewis R. Parker
William Maurice Morgan
Richard Irvine Dugan
Edwin Minor Day
Jack Weston Wood
James Herbert Wallace

To be major, Medical Corps

William Warren Roe, Jr.

To be captain, Medical Corps

Wayne Peter Beardsley, subject to examination required by law.

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

Frank Marion Lee

To be chaplain (lieutenant colonel), United States Army

James Hugh O'Neill, subject to examination required by law.

To be major, United States Army

William Lewis Cooper

POSTMASTERS

MISSISSIPPI

Ida L. Cain, Prairie.

NEBRASKA

Meredith Y. Cloud, Elk Creek.

NEW JERSEY

Arthur F. Metz, Cranford.
Patrick F. Whelan, Jr., Somerdale.
John P. Larkin, Spotswood.

NEW YORK

Helen Regan, Carle Place.
Kenneth L. Dubuque, Peru.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alta M. Hansey, Nome.

OKLAHOMA

Alma C. Binns, Kellyville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*God be merciful unto us, and bless us;
and cause Thy face to shine upon us;
That Thy way may be known upon
earth, Thy saving health among all
nations.*

*Let the people praise Thee, O God; let
all the people praise Thee.*

*O let the nations be glad and sing for
joy: for Thou shalt judge the people
righteously, and govern the nations
upon earth.*

*Let the people praise Thee, O God; let
all the people praise Thee.*

*Then shall the earth yield her in-
crease; and God, even our own God, shall
bless us.*

*God shall bless us; and all the ends of
the earth shall fear Him.*

Let us pray:

*Our Father, which art in heaven,
hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom
come. Thy will be done, in earth as it
is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily
bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as
we forgive those who trespass against
us. And lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from evil. For Thine is
the kingdom, and the power, and the
glory forever.*

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3755. An act to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) entitled "An act to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports in the United States, and for other purposes."

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL J. McDONOUGH, DECEASED

Mr. FERNANDEZ, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WAYNE MORSE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of

the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

This bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of \$5,000 to the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased, late of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Michael J. McDonough as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle in Boston, Mass., on November 19, 1944.

The Senate reduced the sum to \$2,500, and at the conference the House conferees agreed to the sum of \$2,500 as set forth in the Senate amendment.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report. The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the occasion for the present coal strike was the demand of the head of the United Mine Workers Union for a 10-cent-per-ton royalty on all bituminous coal produced, and it is likewise the occasion for failure to enter into a new contract.

The stoppage of coal shipments has already affected many industries. In two more weeks the effect will be Nation-wide. I have been reliably informed that the Potomac Electric Power Co., which furnishes power for the District of Columbia, has only a 2-week supply of coal, and that the Virginia Electric & Power Co., which serves most of the district I represent, has only a 2-week supply. The Detroit automobile manufacturers reported on Monday that they had only a 2-week supply of steel.

I challenge the right of any individual or group of individuals to deny to the American people the essentials of life. I likewise challenge the right of any union to impose an excise tax on the goods it produces.

For the purpose of definitely settling that issue, I have today introduced a bill which is H. R. 6259 to make it unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees who are engaged

in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

The provisions of the bill are not applicable with respect to any amounts deducted from the compensation of any employee and paid to a labor organization by an employer in payment of dues or other similar fees payable by such employee to such labor organization.

The penalty for a willful violation of the act will be a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enforce the act.

The bill carries definitions of the words "commerce", "goods", "produced", and "representative."

The issue involved in this proposed legislation is so vital and so fundamental that I hope the House Committee on the Judiciary, to which the bill will be referred, will act promptly on it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include a resolution.

Mr. MCKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three letters.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette by a staff writer, dated Saturday, April 27, 1946.

THE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, speaking of surpluses, do you know what the War Assets Administration is? It is the successor to the War Assets Corporation. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Administration. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Board. That was the successor to the Surplus Property Administration.

Do you still wonder why the public does not get a chance to buy surplus war goods?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Governor of the State of North Dakota; also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Daily News of April 24.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Raymond Moley.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

PEACE WITH ITALY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, peace proceedings for Italy are currently under way in Paris. The nature of the Italian peace there determined will have profound effect upon world peace and world security.

Because I know Italy and the Italian people, I know that those people did not want war. They were forced into war against their will by a cruel dictatorship which they themselves helped overthrow at earliest possible opportunity. Elemental justice dictates recognition of those facts.

Let us now demonstrate that we genuinely want peace and good will among nations. Let us write a peace with Italy that will safeguard her democratic ideals, assure her economic self-sufficiency, and permit her, as a nation which has contributed outstandingly to the world's progress, to take her place in the United Nations, there to play her proper role in concert with other nations whose aim is to prevent a World War III.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to get the floor for the purpose of expressing my regret that on April 13 there was no record vote on the two amendments which in my estimation so weaken the extension of the selective-service legislation as rightly to subject the Congress to the gravest reproaches. The bill in its present form will almost inevitably convey the impression abroad that this country is too inert to face up to its war-imposed obligations. I can see no reason why we should hesitate to ask boys of 18 to perform a public service which subjects them to no serious hazards and will confer upon them many incidental benefits. I earnestly hope that another body will take a more robust and responsible view of this legislation.

DR. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I read the following from the Messenger, published by the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, of Washington, D. C., volume 2, No. 13, for May 1946:

DR. MONTGOMERY—CONGRESSIONAL CHAPLAIN
FOR 25 YEARS

On April 11, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, minister emeritus of Metropolitan Church, completed a quarter century of service as Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives. His prayers at the opening of the sessions have been printed from time to time, and are available in book form. In his ministrations over the spiritual welfare of one of the greatest lawmaking bodies on earth, he witnessed in panoramic review legislative transactions which offer mirrored events of great significance in the Nation's history.

A great chaplain, a great minister, a great man of God—Dr. Montgomery, we are proud of you.

I am sure I voice the sentiment of the entire membership as I say to you: Dr. Montgomery, we are proud of you. May God give you health, strength, and continued life to serve with us and pray for us for many years to come.

AN INSULT TO A GI

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night in my home town of York, Pa., a Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner was held, at which time Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace and a candidate for the Senate were the principal speakers.

Prior to the dinner the candidate was being interviewed by a newspaper reporter; the candidate pointed to the reporter's discharge button and asked, "Where did you buy that?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why any GI should be so insulted. This button represented his honorable discharge. This GI had 37 months in the Army, 17 months overseas, and plainly told the candidate, "I earned this one."

A candidate who is so untactful will, no doubt, have a tough job being re-elected to the Senate. After all why should he criticize anyone for wearing a discharge button. He is an old bachelor and had no kin in this or the other war.

The candidate for the Senate is lucky that the veteran was not quick on the trigger and did not plant a stiff punch on his jaw. A candidate who will insult a man who served his country for more than 3 years should go into his campaign with a broken jaw.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the newspaper article which appeared in the York (Pa.) Dispatch on April 29, 1946, that reported this incident.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

SENATOR GUFFEY, IN YORK, INSULTS AN
EX-SERVICEMAN

When it comes to World War II veterans and their discharge buttons, Senator JOSEPH GUFFEY, who wants to be reelected next November, has a perverted sense of humor.

While interviewing Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace outside of the Valencia ballroom Saturday night, a York Dispatch newspaperman, only 4 months out of the United States Army, was asked by Senator GUFFEY as he pointed to the reporter's discharge button, "Where did you buy that?"

The newspaperman, accustomed to listening to practical jokers in the Army, answered the silly question nonchalantly, "I spent 37 months in the Army, 17 months overseas. I earned this one." Secretary Wallace told GUFFEY he knew "this man for a long time."

At this point the untactful Senator was informed by the ex-serviceman that he represented York's evening newspaper. The then somewhat flabbergasted politician immediately changed his humorous tune. He began congratulating the former soldier-reporter for a fine job "done in the service," but the reporter wasn't particularly interested. The newspaperman asked GUFFEY what he plans to do for the veterans "if he is reelected." "I am going to give them everything I can. They deserve the best. I'm also going to vote to give the soldiers in the Army more money, too." As the interview ended GUFFEY reminded the reporter, "Now, don't forget to quote me on my stand about veterans."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KNUTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FLYING PAY FOR NAVAL NAVIGATORS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to do simple justice to those men who served as navigators in the Navy and Marine Corps. The bill would provide the same bonus provision upon discharge as that now paid to navigators in the Army Air Corps.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the House and particularly to the attention of the Committee on Naval Affairs, hoping that speedy consideration may be given this bill.

BROADCAST OVER STATION WOL

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under date of April 29, 1946, a Member of the other body broadcasted a statement over Station WOL and the Mutual network, which, in my opinion, was an attack on at least two Members of this House. This is not a violation of the Rules of the House but goes far down the road in that direction. Later we may deem it advisable to answer these untruthful charges.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include the full statement by the Member of the other body to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER OVER
STATION WOL AND THE MUTUAL NETWORK
MONDAY, APRIL 29, 6:15 P. M.

My friends, in January of this year Wilson W. Wyatt became National Housing Expediter. Shortly after that he recommended an emergency housing program for veterans. This program required legislation.

Seldom has any program met with such widespread and enthusiastic popular acceptance.

President Truman approved the veterans' emergency housing program and recommended the necessary legislation to Congress. All of the important veterans' organizations approved this program.

In every State the mayors of cities where veterans are desperately in need of homes welcomed this program.

The editorial pages of the press, with a rare degree of unanimity, have hailed this program as the best answer to the veterans' housing needs.

The National Association of Home Builders endorsed this program in convention assembled.

The executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards wrote a letter to Mr. Wyatt, expressing his enthusiasm for this program.

The American Federation of Labor and the CIO have pledged their full cooperation in this program.

When Mr. Wyatt first appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee leaders of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, pledged their support to this program.

And so the veterans thought that housing was on the way.

But four long months have gone by since Mr. Wyatt became Housing Expediter—and Congress has not yet approved the legislation which President Truman called the very heart of the veterans' housing program.

What are the reasons for this legislative delay?

The reason cannot be that the housing emergency has miraculously disappeared. On the contrary the emergency is becoming worse every day, as more and more veterans return to civilian life. And everybody knows that it is becoming worse every day.

The reason for legislative delay cannot be that the American people have reneged on their solemn obligation to be fair and square with those who fought and won our greatest war. The American people never renege. Every public-opinion poll shows that the people overwhelmingly support the veterans' emergency housing program.

Nor can the reason for legislative delay be that flaws in the program have been discovered with the passage of time. Time has only served to make proposals which were

clearly right a few months ago, even more clearly right today.

Yet, the months of legislative delay have not occurred by accident. The delay has occurred by design. The delay has occurred through the deliberate efforts of those who do not want a veterans' emergency housing program. They do not want it for reasons that are selfish beyond description. They do not want it because some people and groups are profiting by the scarcity.

In the final analysis, the responsibility for this delay now rests with a relatively few Members of the Congress of the United States. These few persons, because of their strategic positions on certain congressional committees, have been able to wield an influence out of all proportion to the number of people whom they represent.

In fact, even the people living in the districts which these few persons represent, are not in sympathy with what they are now doing. I cannot believe that a majority of the people in any congressional district in the United States is opposed to taking every step necessary for the success of the veterans' emergency housing program.

The only thing that has enabled these few obstructionists to persist in their course, is that it has been a concealed course. When the veterans' housing bill was first up for consideration in the House, these obstructionists stated that they were for the program, but that it could all be done without legislation. When this statement was proved to be wrong, they admitted that legislation was required. But they said that it ought to be in a different kind of bill, and referred to a different kind of committee. These few obstructionists resorted to every old trick of those who do not want to say "Yes" but who are afraid to say "No." They even succeeded in avoiding a record vote, on the most critical items in the veterans' housing bill.

Through this manipulation and subterfuge, the House of Representatives as a whole did not have a full opportunity, when the bill was before it, to study the facts carefully and come to a just conclusion. For this, most of the Members of the House were not at fault.

Then the bill came up in the Senate, and the vital provisions for premium payments and guaranteed markets were inserted. Without these provisions to speed up production, the program cannot succeed. In this satisfactory form, the bill passed the Senate.

The situation now is that the veterans' housing bill is in conference between the Senate and the House. This means that Representatives of both bodies have been designated, to decide between the inadequate bill passed by the House and the satisfactory bill passed by the Senate. The conferees will be meeting again this week. I am confident that the House will be very likely to accept what its own conferees propose. In short, the life or death of the veterans' emergency housing program rests largely in the hands of the seven men, appointed by the House, to represent them in conference.

Some of these seven House conferees fought with all their strength to get a satisfactory veterans' housing bill, when it was first considered by the House. Who they are is a matter of public record. But there are one or two of these seven House conferees—and they, too, are a matter of public record—who did all they could to prevent the House from passing a satisfactory veterans' housing bill. In this, they succeeded. The critical issue now is whether these same obstructionists can succeed again in conference this week—or whether public opinion and the righteousness of the veterans' cause can make them change their minds and alter their course.

The veterans and the people of this country, who want and need the veterans' emergency housing program, have just one first job to do. It is easy for them to find out who is standing in their way. It should not be difficult for them to take these obstructionists to task.

If those working against the veterans' emergency housing bill are allowed to succeed, it will give heart and strength to the enemies of every program for the welfare of the veterans and the people.

The bill about which I have thus far been speaking, is essential to expedite the production of materials and houses for veterans. But the veteran already knows that houses alone are not enough. There must be the kind of houses which can be bought or rented at a price the veteran can afford to pay. The Senate recently passed another housing bill, sponsored by myself and two other Senators. It is known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. This bill is just as essential to the veterans' emergency housing program as premium payments and guaranteed markets. For without the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, there is every indication that most of the houses which get built will be far beyond the veterans' financial reach.

It is a matter of common sense that, if the housing bill now in conference is defeated, it will be just that much harder to enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. It will be just that much harder to enact any of the other measures, in which veterans have a tremendous stake—the improvement of social security, the development of better health measures, the reinforcement of the full employment bill with specific full employment programs.

One of the founding fathers said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. In more recent times, eternal public vigilance of what Congress is doing, has become the price of true democracy. Without this public vigilance, small and selfish groups can dominate decisions, and the public interest is lost sight of when laws are made.

This public vigilance must be exercised whenever vitally important measures are before Congress. Nothing is more certain than that Congress will make the right decisions, if it knows that the people as a whole are watching every step that is taken.

I have only one message to every veteran and his family, living in a trailer, crowded in a slum, or unable to find a home because of the housing emergency.

I have only one message to every fair-minded American, who revolts at the thought that the housing needs of veterans should be shabbily disregarded.

This message to every veteran and to every fair-minded American is that you should watch what is happening this week in Congress—and particularly what is happening in the conference on the veterans' housing bill. By this kind of watching, you will be able to penetrate the secret of why the veterans' emergency housing program has been delayed for so many months. By taking action, when your watching reveals the need for action, you will be able to assure satisfactory housing legislation. This alone will keep faith with the veterans of World War II, who are looking for homes in which to live and rear their families.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two to include editorials and in the third to include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a quotation.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Norris K. Carnes. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$135, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remark in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article appearing in the Washington Post under date of April 29, and in the other to include a telegram from the Governor of Massachusetts and two other letters having to do with the feed shortage in that area.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include statements from the official publication of the National Small Businessmen's Association.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Dave Kirk, editorial writer for the Spokane Chronicle.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial, and in two to include articles by Samuel Crowther.

Mr. ROCKWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Jim Childress.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. ROE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from Hon. Alfred N. Phillips, Jr., former Member of Congress, Fourth Congressional District, Connecticut.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Captain Morrison.

GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include as part of my remarks a resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of Washtenaw County, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the so-called GI bill of rights,

recently placed upon the statute books, has been as disappointing to many of us who participated in its enactment as it has to many veterans who have sought its benefits.

Be it remembered that this law had the support of all veterans' organizations and was a sincere and conscientious effort to assist the veteran over the difficult path of adjusting him to civilian life. Trial and error demonstrate that there should be some amendments to the law. Veterans' organizations are urging such amendments, and I call the attention of the House to this matter in the hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will immediately give consideration to the whole matter.

As an expression of the people of the country, let me call your attention to resolutions adopted by the board of supervisors of Washtenaw County, Mich. The great University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, with its more than 6,000 veterans in attendance, is the center of Washtenaw County. The resolutions read as follows:

Be it resolved—

Whereas it appears under the GI bill of rights, certain servicemen by reason of occupation, training, or choice, receive greater benefits than others; and

Whereas it appears that for educational purposes, some servicemen may receive benefits and allotments as high as \$6,000 without repayment. While no such provisions are made for servicemen desiring to continue or commence other activities without repayment. (For example: two returned veterans, who shared the same fox hole—one desires the educational program, and may receive benefits up to \$1,500 per year, without repayment; the other one desires farming, and receives no benefits, without repayment); and

Whereas this is an agricultural county, where a great number of returned veterans desire to carry on their various projects: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors, Washtenaw County, Mich., go on record as favoring equal benefits, in outright grants or allotments, without interest or repayment, for said veterans, in the same manner and procedure as are granted other veterans for educational programs; and further

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Congressman and Senators in Washington; to the State Association of Supervisors; and to all boards of supervisors in the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, this board speaks with authority from experience and is not theorizing.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 586.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States, deeply concerned by the alarming increase in traffic accidents since the end of gasoline rationing, has taken positive action to devise ways and means of making our streets and highways safer; and

Whereas to this end the President has called into conference on May 8, 9, and 10 the representatives of States, counties, and municipalities having legal responsibilities in matters of highway safety, together with

representatives of national organizations which are concerned with highway safety; and

Whereas established standards and techniques for traffic accident prevention have proved effective when intelligently applied by public officials in States and communities where strong public support exists for these activities; and

Whereas the President's highway safety conference will be dedicated to a review of these standards and techniques, and to the development of Nation-wide support for their prompt and uniform utilization: Therefore be it

Resolved, That each member of this body be encouraged to take all proper steps to bring before the American people their personal responsibilities for exercising utmost care in the avoidance of traffic accidents and supporting all sound and necessary highway safety programs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPTOMETRY CORPS IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3755) to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "an accredited" and insert "a recognized."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "college," and insert "college."

Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "the" down to and including "Association" in line 22, and insert "Surgeon General."

Page 3, line 3, after "therewith" insert "by the Surgeon General."

Page 3, line 3, after "therewith" strike out all down to and including line 6.

Page 4, line 3, strike out "(who shall be an ophthalmologist)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of what the amendments accomplish, but will the gentleman make a brief statement for the record as to just what the Senate amendments will bring about?

Mr. SHORT. I shall be very happy to do that.

The amendments simply place in the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States Army, instead of the American Optometric Association, the authority to decide who shall be commissioned in the service. There are only 50 or 60 persons this would affect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This bill was passed unanimously?

Mr. SHORT. It was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Military Affairs and passed the House unanimously. It was passed by the Senate yesterday unanimously. I talked to Senator BARKLEY and Senator HALE and the rest of those interested in this matter, and they want these amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, can he tell me whether this will speed up the discharge of doctors from the Army? At the present time

there are more doctors in the Army than there were when the war was at its height. There is 1 physician to every 130 enlisted men, 7.5 per thousand, while during the war there were 5.5 physicians to every thousand enlisted men. Can the gentleman say whether anything can be done to see that some of the physicians now in the Army can come home?

Mr. SHORT. May I say to my friend from Nebraska, in whose district I have been, and whom I love very much, that I believe that on the whole the Army has done a magnificent job of discharging these people; in fact, we perhaps discharged them too fast too soon.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I point out that there is 1 physician in the Army to every 130 enlisted men, or 7.5 per thousand. There are more physicians in the Army now than when the war was going full blast.

Mr. SHORT. That is true, but I do not want to get into any argument about it because that is irrelevant to this matter.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will yield, may I try to satisfy the mind of the gentleman from Nebraska on the question of the number of doctors in the armed forces at this time by saying that there are many thousand fewer physicians in the Army now than we did have, and they are being discharged as rapidly as possible under the point system and under the recommendations of the State procurement agencies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are more doctors in the Army now in proportion than there were during the war.

Mr. MAY. On the basis of proportion, that is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am talking about the number of doctors in the Army proportionately.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will recognize that.

Mr. MAY. There are more in proportion to the number of men in the Army now.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it would do every Member of the House a great deal of good at this time to spend a day in a recognized Army hospital among the American wounded and see what they think of the discharge of good physicians and surgeons back to civilian life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO HON. PAUL BROWN, OF
GEORGIA

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we who serve in these halls are well aware of the fact that the manifold duties of a Member of Congress involve very constant and very arduous work. Such service, despite its extreme importance, has often been called a thankless task. Here a faithful, able, conscientious, industrious public servant, of a type more interested in constructive accomplishment in accordance with American ideals than in sensational newspaper headlines, often receives more of criticism than of commendation. But the hope of our country must necessarily depend upon this kind of Representatives of the people, devoted to the fundamental principles of our Government. The interest of such a Member is in the common welfare, not in mere public acclaim. Helpful criticism that enables him the better to perform his duties he invites and gladly receives, but sometimes he is subjected to inaccurate, undeserved, misleading, and untruthful censure which unfortunately finds its way into the columns of the public press.

May I preface what I have to say with the statement that I have no purpose to criticize those columnists whose unbiased reports of the news we all read with pleasure, but I certainly have no praise for those who seek to advise the American people that any opinion at variance with their own is necessarily wrong. It seems most lamentable that some of these self-opinionated columnists who frequently endeavor to discredit the Congress could not have been present at the Constitutional Convention to advise Washington and Franklin and Madison and Hamilton and other celebrities in attendance just what kind of government they should advocate, for those early American patriots in their prescribed system of checks and balances were very firm in their conviction of the paramount importance of the Congress. And it might be well in these later days to bear in mind also that dictatorial and totalitarian regimes never rise to power until they attain either the impotence or the abolishment of the legislative branch of government.

One of our Members whom we all, regardless of party, admire and respect, has recently been the subject of such an unjustified columnist attack. I refer to our colleague, PAUL BROWN of Georgia. I doubt if anyone in this body is more highly esteemed and affectionately regarded for his sterling worth and outstanding ability and faithful performance of duty than our friend, PAUL BROWN. Who among us is less deserving of political censure than he? In the approximately 13 years of his service he has never dodged a vote and has never missed a roll call or a meeting of his committee.

And yet, one of the columnists, Drew Pearson, assuming to report the proceedings of an executive meeting of a conference committee which he himself, of course, did not attend, and which he insinuatingly stated was "held in the usual secrecy," took occasion, for what purpose you may judge for yourselves, to hurl

his utterly unwarranted abuse upon our colleague, PAUL BROWN. He even left the very strong implication that PAUL BROWN is an enemy of the veterans of the late war, despite the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whose housing bill was the subject matter for the meeting of the conference committee, stated in the hearings on that measure, recorded at page 1411 of the printed proceedings:

Mr. BROWN lost everything he had in this war and, of course, we sympathize with him very much. I do not think he has missed a roll call since he has been a Member of Congress. He is always active and alert to help veterans.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was referring to the fact that PAUL BROWN's only son made the supreme sacrifice in World War II in order that you and I and all the people, including any critical columnists, might be able to continue to live under and enjoy our American system of government, of which the Congress is so vital a part and of which this hero's father is an eminent, honored, and distinguished Member. I do not understand the kind of mind or heart which could lead anyone under such circumstances to intimate in public print that PAUL BROWN is a foe of the veterans. And in stating my own judgment, I feel very confident that I state the judgment of all who serve in this House of Representatives of the Congress that PAUL BROWN's district, his State, and his Nation have abundant cause to be proud of his record of service, not only to the veterans, but to all our American people in every walk of life.

The burden of Mr. Pearson's complaint with reference to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] as it appears in the Drew Pearson article on Wednesday, April 24, is to the effect that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] did not agree to the inclusion of subsidies in the conference report on the Patman housing bill. The bill as it had passed the Senate contained two main items that were not in the bill as it passed the House. One was the \$600,000,000 provision for subsidies and the other a guaranty against loss on 200,000 prefabricated houses.

The conference committee on the Patman housing bill met for the first time on the morning of April 18, the day the House recessed. Early that day the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] announced that, insofar as subsidies were concerned, he did not feel that he could vote to report that provision favorably in view of the fact that he believed such action would result in retarding the production of building material. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] was absolutely sincere in this position and it was entirely in accord with the fight he had made in the House to this effect. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] predicated his opposition to subsidies on the announced purpose of those who would have administrative control of them, which was that such subsidies, or so-called premium payments, were to be paid only for production by any person

or firm or company or organization above and beyond its normal output, and he called attention to the fact that under existing conditions much of established business could not even reach its normal output and thus become eligible for such payments, but that any new business venture with little or no previous output could likely avail itself of such premiums. He realized also that, though these subsidy payments would not go to the veterans, it would be in considerable degree the responsibility of the veterans to repay them to the Federal Government in taxes.

All that Mr. BROWN asked, in spite of his well-known objections to the subsidies, was that the House be allowed to pass on this question again, which is the very usual procedure in conference reports with reference to matters not in agreement, and certainly his request had additional force in this instance inasmuch as on a teller count the House of Representatives had turned down the subsidies by a vote of almost 2 to 1. How, then, could he consistently have done otherwise than to urge that this question be brought back to the House when he was representing the previously expressed will of the House? That is all that Mr. BROWN did, and certainly no Member of this body would criticize him for such a course. In all fairness to himself and to the House his action is to be commended.

As Mr. BROWN had stated in the debate in the House, when the Patman bill was first considered in the committee it contained a type of subsidy to help the builders, but only one or two of the committee voted for this provision. It was eliminated before the bill was brought to the House for action. We are told also that at that time Mr. Wyatt did not express himself in favor of subsidies, but that later Mr. Wyatt and his advisers suggested a plan for a type of subsidies called premium payments and this was offered by way of amendment on the floor of the House, but was defeated in view of the arguments against it.

That Mr. BROWN has very great interest in the veterans is further evidenced by his energetic support of an amendment placed in the bill by the House, and tentatively agreed to in the Committee, providing \$1,000,000,000 under title VI of the Federal Housing Act and another billion dollars in reserve. Under this provision veterans may have insured loans from the FHA up to 90 percent of the funds necessary to buy the material to build houses.

The great majority of the veterans do not have sufficient money for home building. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] urged the importance of this amendment to the veterans in view of the further fact that in practically all communities with a population of less than 10,000 banks and lending institutions seem loath to lend the money under the GI bill of rights. The Patman bill as it passed the House gave priority to veterans in the allocation of scarce materials, and it gave the Expediter extensive powers to help them. Therefore, the increase in funds for the

FHA assured them an opportunity to get the money and obtain the material.

It should be remembered that after some debate in the House it seemed doubtful if any bill of this character could be passed, but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] fought valiantly for the committee bill. Even the chairman of the committee and also the author of the bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], wanted certain amendments. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] even offered a motion to strike out the enacting clause. At the request of the floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] replied to this attempt to nullify the measure, and his arguments prevailed and there were but a few more than 30 votes for the motion on a teller count. Upon similar request, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] spoke in opposition to a substitute bill which was defeated. Members on each side of the aisle will readily agree that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] made an honest, conscientious, and fearless fight for the bill, and he was congratulated by leaders of all factions for his diligent service in behalf of the veterans.

Not only did the floor leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], praise the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] for his outstanding labors for the veterans, as recorded on page 1961 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, but at a later hearing of the Committee on Banking and Currency with reference to another measure, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the author of the housing bill, again took occasion to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] on his work for the housing measure and had this to say of his service in that regard:

Mr. BROWN worked as hard on that bill as any man here and was as helpful as any man in the House in getting it through. He carried the burden sometimes when we could not carry it. That bill really means something.

This statement is found on page 1412, volume II, of the hearings on the extension of the Price Control Act.

Is it not strange, therefore, that in attacking Mr. BROWN and other conferees of similar views, Mr. Pearson, blindly overlooking the high praise Mr. BROWN had received for his service to the veterans, wrote in his column of censure the following statement with reference to these colleagues of ours:

Their colleagues are betting, however, that after hearing from their war-vet constituents during the Easter recess, they won't come back happy.

Certainly any message Mr. BROWN may have received from his veteran constituents should have been one of unstinted praise for his labors in their behalf. And it remains for time to demonstrate even more forcefully the worth of that work which he so conscientiously performed.

In speaking of this beloved colleague, I cannot refrain from citing a few of the many instances of his service to America or from quoting a few attestations of his

colleagues of the excellent record he has made. Mr. Ramspeck, of Georgia, who until his recent retirement was the majority whip of the House, once said of Mr. BROWN:

He, better than anyone in the House, has the ability to talk with other Members personally and influence their action on legislation. He has often assisted me when we had a tight vote coming up. I would rather have his assistance in such a situation than that of any other Member.

That is high praise indeed from one eminently qualified to appraise congressional worth and usefulness.

I remember well that for a long period Mr. BROWN has been the leader each 2 years for the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency designed, perhaps more than all others combined, to stabilize prices for agricultural products.

Mr. BROWN has been a most enthusiastic supporter of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and in his own State, as early as 1925 and 1926, before the law was passed, he was speaking to urge the wisdom of legislation of this character.

Two years ago he led the fight to help depositors and the little banks in his section of the country and the agricultural sections of the West in the bill relating to the absorption of exchange and collection charges. That bill passed the House by a vote of nearly three to one.

When the Bretton Woods agreement was being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, it was generally recognized that Mr. BROWN was the most potent factor in putting it through.

His effective work with reference to the Price Control Act is well known to all who serve in this Chamber. One of the outstanding members of his committee made this statement concerning the service of Mr. BROWN:

He has been of great assistance in many important bills considered in the House. PAUL BROWN has rendered valuable work for the Government and this administration through his position as ranking Democratic Member on the Banking and Currency Committee. During the hardest part of the Bretton Woods fight when it looked as though we were defeated 14 to 13, PAUL BROWN managed to carry the ball and got a favorable report out without any damaging concessions with only 2 votes in the committee against it.

His efforts in helping bring Members along on the difficult problem of reenacting the price-control bill a year ago, and helping in getting a satisfactory authorization for the Export-Import Bank proved of tremendous value in the passage of the administration program.

I have mentioned but a few of the many instances of PAUL BROWN's distinguished congressional career, but they at least serve to indicate his abundant efforts to be helpful to all classes of people who need and deserve legislative assistance. He is held by us all in the highest esteem, and in view of the recent unjustified criticism spread through the country by a grossly misleading column, I could not refrain from voicing my tribute to this fine American gentleman and statesman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not see the item to which the gentleman referred in his remarks, but I have always felt that one of the greatest influences enabling democratic institutions of Government to function was respect for each other's views even where disagreement exists among persons in the exercise of their judgment. To me this is a very deep influence and one I try to follow as far as I humanly can. That is basic. If we do not have respect for one another's views, bitterness and hatred follow and we will have all of the debasing consequences that flow from that state of mind which carries bitterness and hatred. In other words, tolerance, understanding, and respect for each other's views must exist.

I have served with the gentleman from Georgia for 13 years. I concur in everything that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has said. I know of no Member who is more sincere, who is more hard working, who is more devoted to his duties. So far as the particular question of premium payments is concerned, I respect his views and I respect his motives. As a Member of the House and occupying the position of majority leader, and expecting to occupy that same position for the next 2 years, I have received nothing but complete cooperation from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

In reference to the bill in question and the matters therein contained on which we were not in disagreement, I asked him to take the floor in opposition to certain amendments. In connection with bills that have come out of this committee, on which there is a fight, where amendments have been offered by Members which I felt should be opposed, I have gone to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and without hesitation he has taken the floor and made his contribution, always very effectively.

I am sure Mr. Pearson upon reconsideration will recognize that in this case he has unconsciously and unintentionally made a very serious error and I hope he will rectify it because if there is one man that I have met in my journey through life who has impressed me with nobility of motive, with fineness of character, with sincerity of effort, it is our distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. I am sure that Mr. Pearson would not want to intentionally harm anyone. I trust he will read the remarks of the gentleman from Texas and appreciate the high regard that is entertained for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] by his colleagues in the House. Even though Mr. Pearson may be in disagreement with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] on this particular question, I am sure he will recognize that the gentleman from Georgia is entitled to respect even though Mr. Pearson may disagree with him. After all, it is the exercise of his judgment and conscience and, as I stated, I hope Mr. Pearson will rectify, as any man of character would do, the harm that he has unintentionally

inflicted upon the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like the privilege of saying that I, too, concur in your very timely and appropriate remarks with respect to the course of conduct of our valued colleague from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, in the conference on the disagreeing votes between the two Houses on the so-called veterans' housing bill. The columnist, Drew Pearson, has done the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] a very grave injustice. His criticism is without any foundation and without any support of any kind. Instead of being censured, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is entitled to the commendation of the House for standing by the position of the House respecting subsidies and in asking that these views be given consideration in conference, by at least giving the House the opportunity of again voting on subsidies.

If there is one Member of the House who is more devoted than another to veterans and to all worthy measures in behalf of the veterans of all wars, and zealous for their welfare, that Member is the gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, who lost his only son, who lost his all, as you have so well said, in World War II.

Our faithful colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, is recognized for his efficient work as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The House has high regard for his views and conclusion regarding all of the important legislation on which the committee submits reports; in fact, his presentation of important bills is always anxiously awaited. The House has come to rely upon his judgment and his wisdom. It is not too much to say that while he opposed subsidies and while the House followed his leadership in such opposition in a vote of two to one, no Member of the House was more influential in securing the final passage of the bill for veterans' housing than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. It was evident throughout the debates that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], was most anxious to provide sound legislation that would result in housing for veterans. With the vast majority of the House, he believed that the benefits of subsidies would not accrue to the veterans but to others. The ceiling on prices of new housing was to be safeguarded. The funds provided by the Government should be made available to veterans rather than disbursed without a definite yardstick to those who might claim that they were instrumental in

providing housing. The House backed his judgment. Mr. BROWN insisted that all moneys appropriated for veterans should be for the direct benefit of the veterans and not for distribution and disbursement for the benefit of materials men, builders or contractors, under the guise of helping the veterans. It was clear that Mr. BROWN was interested not only in providing housing for veterans but in providing such housing on a sound basis so that veterans could pay for the housing. In a word, the gentleman from Georgia wanted the veteran to get the benefit of funds made available for veterans' housing.

I am, therefore, glad to join in the very deserved tribute so well expressed by you, to the worth, the work and the effective and constructive services of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], not only as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency but as one of the most capable Members of the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have listened with great attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas as he has referred to the attack that has been made against the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. For the past several years the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has lived in the same apartment building where I reside. We have journeyed to and from the Capitol each day. We have discussed many matters. I have learned to know him well. While he is a Democrat, and I pride myself on being a member of the Republican Party, and we sometimes differ—in fact, we usually differ on political affairs and matters—I have learned to respect PAUL BROWN's honor and integrity. I was with him at the time that word came of his son's death. I know of the sacrifice that he has made for his country, and anyone who attacks PAUL BROWN's patriotism or his interest in the welfare of the veterans injures himself rather than the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL BROWN.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas on taking the floor to defend the honor and the integrity of one of his colleagues.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who is now addressing the House, will recall that when we were in executive session soon after the House voted on the so-called veterans' housing bill, that we were considering a bill to authorize an appropriation to move many of the temporary houses to be used by veterans. At that time Mr. Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter, was before our committee, and this question was asked him about the so-called subsidies in the Patman bill, whether or not any testimony was given before the Committee on Banking and Currency when that bill was being considered by that committee to show the House the necessity of subsidies for these

veterans' houses, and he said, "No." The gentleman will recall that statement by Mr. Wyatt. Therefore, regarding any attack on Mr. BROWN's position as to the votes on it, the amendment was not based on evidence before the committee and was not available to the House.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish on my own behalf, and on behalf of the entire Georgia delegation, to express to the distinguished gentleman from Texas our appreciation of the splendid remarks which he has just made regarding our colleague, PAUL BROWN. The article to which he refers clearly indicates that the writer of this article does not know PAUL BROWN and is not familiar with his sterling qualities and outstanding patriotism.

His loyalty to his constituents and to his country cannot be questioned. His record as a Member of this House in several respects surpasses that of any other Member with whom it has been my privilege to serve. His constant attendance at the sessions of this House and at the committee of which he is a member, the able and aggressive manner in which he constantly strives to secure legislation for the benefit of his constituents and of the country as a whole, his studious devotion to his duties, his sincerity of purpose and integrity of character, together with his high sense of patriotism, certainly make PAUL BROWN one of the best legislators in Congress, as well as one who is devoted to the best interest of his people and his country.

He has given far more than many of us to his country, in giving his only son, who served as an officer on a submarine in the Pacific, and whose life was offered on the altar of human freedom.

It has been my pleasure during the 12 years I have been in Congress to be closely associated with PAUL BROWN. I count him among my closest friends and I depend upon him for counsel and advice. Likewise, the entire Georgia delegation, among whom the most cordial relations exist, seek and listen to his advice and counsel on legislative matters. His loyalty to his friends, his constituents, and to his country, together with his splendid ability and high patriotism, make him an outstanding Member of this House. The entire membership of the Georgia delegation realize and appreciate the worth of PAUL BROWN as a friend, as a legislator, and as a public servant.

I wish to again assure the gentleman from Texas that the members of the Georgia delegation appreciate what he has said this morning, and likewise we are deeply grateful for the fine and timely words of tribute that have been so well expressed by other Members on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. While I have often disagreed with some of the views of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown], who is the senior majority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I think that all who have observed him know of his fidelity to duty and his constant and unremitting interest in the discharge of his duties. I do not believe he has ever missed a call of the roll in this House in all the years he has been here. He has been equally faithful in the discharge of his duties in the committee. He has the respect and confidence of the members of that committee. I hope we can always disagree with our colleagues and still retain respect and confidence for them. Certainly the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown], who lost his only son in the war, has by his sacrifice demonstrated that he must have a very deep and abiding interest in the veterans. I know how he has suffered by reason of this loss. I know that any statement as to his indifference to the welfare of the veteran must have deeply wounded him. I hope we can disagree and continue to disagree, but still have confidence, respect, and friendship for our fellow men and our colleagues.

Mr. LANHAM. That statement is most appropriate, coming as it does from the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, upon which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] has served so diligently, ably, and faithfully.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It has been my privilege to serve for nearly 14 years with our distinguished colleague and friend from Georgia [Mr. Brown]. He is one of the finest men in the House, and one of its most useful Members. I am very happy that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has taken occasion today to call attention to his record and to give other Members of the House an opportunity to testify to the facts.

AMERICAN AVIATORS AND GENERAL MIHAILOVICH

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 I inserted into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post entitled "In Defense of Mihailovich." This I prefaced with a few words urging upon this Government the suggestion that everything possible be done to insure a just and fair trial for this man to whose

loyalty and courage some 600 American aviators owe their lives.

Today I would call to the attention of this House the treatment meted out to a special delegation of these airmen by their Commander in Chief and by our Department of State. These fliers left their homes, their jobs, and their families at considerable expense and inconvenience in order to present their point of view directly to the President and to the Acting Secretary of State. Their story is very simple: They owe their lives to General Mihailovich. During their stay with his troops not one of them nor any of their 600 companions similarly rescued had seen or heard reliably reported the slightest evidence of any collaboration between General Mahailovich and our common enemy—Germany.

A specially chartered airliner—the Mission of Mihailovich—brought them to Washington Sunday afternoon. They are leaving this afternoon greatly disillusioned and deeply disappointed, having been barred from even the briefest of audiences with their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

First interviewed by Mr. Barbour, chairman of Southern European Affairs, they finally were given opportunity to discuss the matter with the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson.

In telling me their experience they stressed the point that they understand Tojo is to have an inter-Allied trial. That is what they are asking for General Mihailovich. They do not ask for his release. They ask only for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I must express my deep regret at the lack of judgment of what is truly in the public interest which caused this refusal to permit these young men to present to their Commander in Chief resolutions urging him to do all possible to insure justice to the man to whom 600 living Americans owe the greatest debt one man can possibly owe to another—their lives.

I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks a copy of the resolution of these loyal American aviators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN AIRMEN TO AID GENERAL MIHAILOVICH AND THE SERBIAN PEOPLE, WASHINGTON, MAY 1, 1946

Whereas we, official delegates of the National Committee of American Airmen To Aid General Mihailovich and the Serbian People, have come to our Nation's Capital from all parts of the United States at our own expense, in order to present to the President of the United States and to the Acting Secretary of State our very considerable evidence upon behalf of the Allied general, Draja Mihailovich, of Yugoslavia, who has saved the lives of our delegation and the more than 600 additional Allied airmen whom we represent.

Whereas we have sought in vain to present at "top level" (that is, to the President and the Acting Secretary of State) positive and documented disproof of the charges made by Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, that Mihailovich is a "traitor" or "collaborationist";

Whereas we have been denied the right formally to petition, at first hand, our Commander in Chief personally to intervene to

insure that we be subpoenaed as material witnesses, and that testimony of Allied personnel attached to Mihailovich's headquarters in wartime Yugoslavia be submitted to the trial court;

Whereas, in addition, we have been denied the right personally to ask of our President and Commander in Chief and the acting chief executive of our Department of State that all documents from the files of the State and War Departments be admitted in the trial of General Mihailovich; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, representing the National Committee of American Airmen To Aid General Mihailovich and the Serbian People, despite the failure of our President personally to grant us an audience to hear our case at the end of this vital mission—an omission which we ascribe to the Presidential Secretariat—and despite Mr. Acheson's flat refusal to receive us personally to set forth a case which the State Department already has championed in a weak and watery form, and despite the timorous and apparently insincere attitude of the United States Government toward the Tito regime in Yugoslavia, we shall unrelentingly continue the fight for a fair trial and absolute justice for General Draja Mihailovich. By this we mean that we shall, in our home cities and home States and through our Congressmen and our United States Senators, continue unflinchingly to insist upon a fair, interallied trial for Mihailovich, without which we American veterans consider that international justice and morality have ceased to exist.

National Committee of American Airmen To Aid General Mihailovich and the Serbian People; First Lt. William L. Rogers, Manteno, Ill.; Lt. Richard L. Felman, New York, N. Y.; Staff Sgt. Hal D. Souther, Milwaukee, Wis.; Lt. Oscar Menaker, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Tech. Sgt. Gerald E. Wagner, Roanoke, Va.; Lt. Donald F. Rice, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Lt. Charles L. Davis, Washington, D. C.; Lt. Charles F. Gracz, Chicago, Ill.; Staff Sgt. John F. O'Grady, Jr., Clifton, N. J.; Lt. George Salapa, Jr., Cleveland, Ohio; Tech. Sgt. Gus T. Brown, Jr., Luling, Tex.; Staff Sgt. Mike McKool, Dallas, Tex.; Staff Sgt. David J. O'Connell, Chicago, Ill.; Staff Sgt. Neal S. Janosky, Milwaukee, Wis.; First Lt. John E. Scroggs, Kansas City, Mo.; First Lt. John P. Devlin, Pittsburgh, Pa.; First Lt. Robert W. Eckman, Chicago, Ill.; Staff Sgt. David E. La Bissoniere, Milwaukee, Wis.; Staff Sgt. Denzil Radabaugh, Masetown, W. Va.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BLACK-OUT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 5719, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all after "15," down to and including "thereafter" in line 9 and insert "Up to and including December 31, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this merely provides a definite date for the expiration of the act.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the committee is in favor of it?

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LeCOMPTE (at the request of Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa), for 1 week, on account of sickness in the family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2. An act to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 2, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Trade of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., May 6, 1946.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 4871 and S. 1367, providing for three additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. Secretary Wallace will be the first witness.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Schedule for the closing days of hearings on the omnibus river and harbor authorization bill is as follows:

(Thursday, May 2, 1946)

Tombigbee-Tennessee Rivers.

(Friday, May 3, 1946)

Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn. Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.

Schuylkill River, Pa., deepening of channel.

Illinois River, small-boat harbor at Peoria, Ill.

San Diego Harbor and Mission Bay, Calif.

Columbia River, from Vancouver, Wash., to The Dalles, Oreg.

(Monday and Tuesday, May 6 and 7, 1946)

Big Sandy River, Tug and Levisa Forks, Va., W. Va., and Ky.

(Wednesday and Thursday, May 8 and 9, 1946)

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, May 7, 1946, in the committee hearing room, 247 Old House Office Building, on H. R. 3908, entitled: "A bill to provide increased pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein during other than a period of war," which was introduced by Representative LESINSKI, of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1238. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$1,000,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 542); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$600,000,000 for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (H. Doc. No. 543); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1240. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission, entitled "International Phosphate Cartels"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1241. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4567. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4046. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard S. Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5631) for the relief of Joseph John Gmurczyk, Jr., and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 6259. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to make unlawful certain harmful and disruptive practices in commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 6260. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1944, relating to contract settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 6261. A bill to grant certain veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 6262. A bill to transfer the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior to Casper, Wyo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6263. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1943, so as to authorize inclusion of periods of education and training in an Army Transportation Corps civilian marine school as "service in the merchant marine"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 6264. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1944, relating to contract settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 6265. A bill to create a Department of Corrections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6266. A bill to decrease the debt limit of the United States from \$300,000,000,000 to \$275,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6267. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain commissioned naval air navigators; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6268. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 6269. A bill to decrease the debt limit of the United States from \$300,000,000,000 to \$275,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6270. A bill to provide for the payment of members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or re-enter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia while in military pay status prior to assignment to active duty; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 6271. A bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to bring about uniformity and coordination in the allocation of field and departmental positions under the grades of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6272. A bill to provide that a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not be reduced during his hospitalization or domiciliary care; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 6273. A bill to provide an award for arrested tuberculosis cases of World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6274. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on Claims.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal laws relative to matching by the Federal Government of amounts expended by States and their political subdivisions on account of old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to issue such orders as will prevent the closing of Fort Devens and the Lovell General Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with regard to removal from office of the present Governor; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile, informing that the Day of the Americas will be celebrated at a session of the next regular legislature, which commences on May 21; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6275. A bill for the relief of Leon H. Watson, doing business as Leon Watson & Associates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6276. A bill for the relief of Tsunezo Tanaka and his wife, Michiko Tanaka; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6277. A bill for the relief of Carl D. Soresi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 6278. A bill for the relief of Patrick Dennis O'Connell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

1848. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 121 citizens of Toronto, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting Senate bill 1678, to require the registration of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. By the SPEAKER: Petition of A. C. Hargis, secretary, the Federal Land Bank of Houston, Houston, Tex., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the suggestion that the lending power of the land bank commissioners be allowed to lapse; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1850. Also, petition of Donald Haahr and others, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House amendments that would weaken price-control structure; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1851. Also, petition of the Texas Ports Association, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence Waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1852. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the \$50,000,000 appropriation bill for the relief of sufferers from the tidal wave which occurred on April 1, 1946; to the Committee on the Territories.

1853. Also, petition of the executive board of the Texas State Industrial Union Council, CIO, urging consideration of their resolution with reference to effective price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 2, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Msgr. John K. Cartwright, D. D., rector, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we pray Thy blessing on us as we gather today to deliberate for our country's welfare.

Thou hast given us peace after war. Grant us the wisdom and the virtue to deserve peace and so to use the authority which our fellow citizens have given us as to make this world more to accord with Thy will and Thy holy purpose.

We pray that we may be able to please Thee in righteousness and that the darkness of many peoples may soon be light and that peace and freedom may heal their wounds as ours have been so greatly healed. Grant that with us they may seek for abiding peace, not in the accidents of casual circumstances but in Thy providence and blessing, for Thou art the very source of peace. Grant us the peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 1, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 1, 1946, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5719) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased;

H. R. 3755. An act to establish an Optometry Corps in the Medical Department of the United States Army; and

H. R. 5719. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, as amended.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 1, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2) to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 4 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, in order that I may be able to keep an engagement and attend the bar association meeting in my State, which convenes tomorrow and the next day, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on those days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate until Tuesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next few days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate tomorrow and Saturday on official business as a member of the